

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks is requested. After entry of this reply, claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 18-27 are added.

In the office action dated March 22, 2007, the Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 8-11 and 13-17 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687) in view of Fin (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444) and further in view of Matsuda et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,328); and rejects claims 5-7 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687) in view of Fin (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444), and further in view of Rutledge et al, *"Using Microsoft PowerPoint 2000."*

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 8-11, and 13-17 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687) in view of Fin (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444) and further in view of Matsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,238). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

A rejection under §103 requires a showing of all of the following: 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references as suggested by the Examiner (it is not sufficient to say that the cited reference can be modified or combined without a teaching in the prior art to suggest the desirability of the modification; 2) there must also be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3) the references must teach or suggest all limitations of the claims. The teaching or suggestion to combine or modify the applied art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not in applicant's specification (MPEP § 2143).

The combination of references cited does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Further, the references do not provide a suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the references as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner, in the office action dated March 22, 2007, on page 3 and 4, acknowledges that for claim 1, Craig fails to explicitly teach said computer instructions for transmitting comprising a shared web browser to allow the leader to surf through the internet and to cause said other computers to follow the leader through the internet; and computer instructions for receiving additional information entered in a shared web browser white board from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information, and wherein the additional information is entered by a user of a computer from the plurality of other computers to be associated with the already displayed information; and computer instructions for receiving text based conferencing information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information in a shared web browser window separate from the white board, thereby not altering the information displayed in the shared web browser and the shared web browser white board.

The Examiner relies on Fin for the teaching of computer instructions for transmitting comprising a shared web browser to allow the leader to surf through the internet and to cause said other computers to follow the leader through the internet (abstract, col. 3, lines 12 - 55), and computer instructions for receiving additional information entered in a shared web browser white board from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein said other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information, and

wherein the additional information is entered by a user of a computer from the plurality of other computers to be associated with the already displayed information; and computer instructions for receiving text-based conferencing information from at least one of the other computers over the network, wherein other computers and said leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information (figures 2, 4 and 13; col. 3, lines 12-55; col. 11, lines 17-50; col. 19, line 4 to col. 20, line 7).

However, Fin does not disclose a shared web browser white board and interactive text conferencing. Additionally, Fin only teaches simultaneous display and control web pages in web browsers (abstract; col. 3, lines 12 – 55; col. 11, lines 17-50; and col. 19, line 4 to col. 20, line 7). Even if the illustrate window in Fin (figures 2, 4 and 13) are interpreted as a white board allowing interactive text messaging, the text messaging of Fin is displayed within or on the white board. So, in Fin, any interactive text messaging between the users during and about the presentation (display) on the white board would necessarily alter the ongoing display on the white board. The present invention features computers each simultaneously displaying the text-based conferencing information in a shared web browser side bar window separate from the white board to not alter the information displayed in the shared web browser white board.

The Examiner further cited Matsuda for the teaching that other computers and leader computer each generally simultaneously display the additional information in a shared web browser window separate from the white board, thereby not altering the information displayed in the shared web browser and the shared web browser white board (i.e. figure 17). However, Matsuda does not teach a shared web browser. Figure 17 of Matsuda shows “a photograph indicative of a display example of a shared virtual space” (col. 4, lines 34-35). The larger display pane in figure 17 is the viewport for the VRML interpreter described in Matsuda. It

provides a three dimensional display of a shared virtual space also referred to as “the world,” wherein virtual life objects reside (col. 14, lines 20-23).

The Examiner relies on the same quotations of Fin and Matsuda and the same reasoning for the rejection of independent claims 8, 9, and 11. For the above reasons, the combination of Craig, Fin and Matsuda do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the claimed recitations. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 11 are patentable over Craig, Fin, and Matsuda.

The Examiner rejects claims 5-7 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Craig (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,687) in view of Fin (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444), and further in view of Rutledge et al, “*Using Microsoft PowerPoint 2000.*” Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding independent claim 5, the prior art, either alone or in combination, fails to disclose, teach or suggest initiating a collaborative presentation by a leader, from a leader’s computer, to a plurality of participants’ computers, where the computer of each of the participants generally simultaneously displays the information on the leader’s computer, where the participants collectively surf through the Internet according to web sites selected by the leader on the leader’s computer, and the leader can designate one of the participants as a new leader, so that a presentation of information, or a selection of a web site, on the new leader’s computer causes the information presented, or web site selected, on the new leader’s computer to be generally simultaneously displayed on the computer of each of the other participants.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims distinguish over the prior art, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the 35 USC §103 rejections.

*Claims Added by this Response and Amendment*

Claims 18-27 are added by this response and amendment to more completely cover certain aspects of applicant's invention. Claim 18 is an independent claim. Claims 19-27 are dependent thereon. All added claims recite elements patentable over the prior art of record, elements providing presenters and users with advantages and efficiencies over the prior art in view of the shared web browser interactivity capabilities detailed above.

The recitation of claims 18-27 find support throughout the specification and drawings, and particularly in portions of the specification including, but not limited to, the following:

- claim 18 - page 16, lines 1-18;
- claim 19 - page 4, lines 5-6;
- claim 20 - page 7, line 15 through page 8, line 18;
- claim 21 - page 12, lines -6;
- claim 22 - page 11, lines 2-8;
- claim 23 - page 10, line 23 through page 11, line 3;
- claim 24 - page 11, lines 3-5;
- claim 25 - page 10, lines 19-23;
- claim 26 - page 10, lines 9-11; and
- claim 27 - page 11, lines 6-7.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that pending claims 1-27 are allowable, that the application is in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue an early notice of allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney in the event that a telephone interview will advance prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce D. George  
Registration No. 43,631

Date: September 24, 2007

Blank Rome LLP  
One Logan Square  
18<sup>th</sup> & Cherry Streets  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-569-5798